

Remarks

Claims 21-23, 26-28, 31 and 34-37 are pending.

Rejections Based On The Combination Of Nerlikar And Olsen

Claims 21-23 and 26 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Nerlikar (5629981) in view of Olsen (6952780). As detailed below, the combination of Nerlikar and Olsen does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 21.

Nerlikar teaches a fax machine printing a faxed document only when the intended recipient is confirmed by RFID and, optionally, by "biological or voice signature." The pertinent text in Nerlikar is quoted below.

"Once secretary A sends the document, the network does not transmit the secure document to the receiving facsimile machine. Instead, the network will store the document electronically in the buffer of the receiving fax machine or at the network buffer. At this point, the network can send an indication to authorized secretary B or other authorized recipient(s) at this location that a secure document is waiting to be retrieved. This indication can come in the form of a light appearing on the fax machine, a flashing light on her telephone, or a note on the computer screen, or a combination of any of the foregoing. This aspect is critical to security because the secure document is not automatically printed when secretary B is not present. At secretary B's convenience, secretary B will go to the fax machine. As secretary B approaches the machine, when proximity to the machine permits, a handshake between secretary B's fax machine reader and secretary B's RFID badge will occur. The fax machine will recognize that secretary B is the authorized recipient and has a secure document ready for receipt. At this point, if secretary B's RFID badge or the system utilizes the additional biological or voice signature security feature, the facsimile machine may ask secretary B to say the name or provide a finger for reading or an eye retina for reading. This additional step guarantees that the person wearing the badge is in fact secretary B. After identification is verified, the fax may once again revalidate with the network server the authorization of secretary B to receive the fax and the fax is printed and all transaction details and records are updated automatically." Nerlikar column 12, lines 13-42.

"Olsen is merely relied upon for displaying the pending print jobs for a user to view." Supplemental Action (mailed March 12, 2007) page 2.

Claim 21 recites "the printer displaying a plurality of pending secured print jobs each having an authorized bio signature associated therewith." Nerlikar describes only a single document faxed from secretary A to secretary B -- there is no plurality of pending print jobs in Nerlikar. And, there is no suggestion in Nerlikar that

even this single document is displayed anywhere as a pending print job, specifically not on the fax machine. Olsen teaches displaying a list of print jobs on a display 126 that is not part of the printer 116. Olsen column 10, lines 36-62 and Fig. 2. So, Olsen also does not teach the printer displaying a plurality of pending print jobs (secured or otherwise). Thus, the combination of Nerlikar and Olsen does not teach this element of Claim 21.

Furthermore, in Olsen the only print jobs that are displayed are those that the "verified" user is authorized to print. That is to say, the act of verifying that the user is authorized to print a print job has already been completed as a prerequisite to the act of displaying the print job(s). In the method of Claim 21, by contrast, the act of comparing bio signatures is not a prerequisite to the act of displaying the print jobs. In fact, the act of comparing bio signatures in Claim 21 is performed after the act of displaying the print jobs. Thus, even if the Examiner were to find a reference that teaches an Olsen type display at a printer, adding such a post-verification display to Nerlikar still does not yield all of the limitations in the method of Claim 21.

This distinction is significant. The method of Claim 21 allows for the printer displaying secured print jobs that are not all associated with the same bio signature. Olsen does not and Nerlikar does not. There is no utility in having a user step up to Nerlikar's fax machine, enter her bio signature to bring up a display of print jobs she is authorized to print as in Olsen, and then, when she has selected from the list, to have her again enter her bio signature as a prerequisite to print what is already known to be an authorized print job. The apparent purpose of Olsen's verification of the list of print jobs is to eliminate the need for a subsequent verification of any individual print job selected from the list. There is just no reason a person skilled in the art would use the display of Olsen in the fax printing procedure of Nerlikar without eliminating either the "pre-listing" verification of Olsen or the "post-selection" verification of Nerlikar.

For all of these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness based on the combination of Nerlikar and Olsen.

Method Claims 36 and 37 -- Associating A Plurality of Authorized Bio Signatures

Claims 36 and 37 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Drabble WO20062474 in view of well known prior art "for the same reasons" as Claims 27 and 28. Method Claim 36, however, is not a counterpart to system Claim

27. Claim 36 recites a computer associating a plurality of authorized bio signatures with a single job. The Examiner has made no showing that either Drabble or the so-called "well known prior art" teach this association. In fact, they do not. The rejection of Claim 36 (and Claim 37 depending from Claim 36) should be withdrawn.

A Second Biometric Device Entering Bio Signatures **Directly** Into The Printer

Claim 27 was rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Drabble WO20062474 in view of "well known prior art." Claim 27 recites a second biometric identification device operatively connected to the printer for entering bio signatures **directly** into the printer. Neither of Drabble's video cameras enters bio signatures directly into the printer. And, there is absolutely no suggestion whatsoever in Drabble that his "facial biometric template" could or should be implemented at the printer. Indeed, implementing Drabble's facial imaging and matching method at the printer would negate the ability to display the document on the computer screen, as expressly taught at page 4. The rejections based on Drabble should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the pending Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204